



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,620	01/31/2005	Eiji Terada	264732US0PCT	6922
22850	7590	10/06/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				DELCOTTO, GREGORY R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
10/06/2009			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,620	TERADA, EIJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory R. Del Cotto	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 8/28/09.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,9-16 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,9-16,18,19,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-16, and 18-22 are pending. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 17 have been canceled. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 8/28/09 have been entered. Claim 20 has been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/28/09 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 1/10/08 have been withdrawn:

None.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bratescu et al (US 6,528,070) in view of Evans et al (6,171,515), Scialla et al (US 6,262,007), Ushio et al (US 6,838,427), and Buzzacarini et al (US 2002/0077265).

Bratescu et al teach emulsions containing an emulsification system containing a mixture of at least one cationic surfactant, at least one anionic surfactant, at least one "bridging surfactant", an oil and water, along with methods for preparing such emulsions. The emulsions are useful in preparing a variety of finished personal care, laundry, and cleaning products, including laundry detergents, textile treatment compositions, etc. See Abstract. More specifically, the emulsions contain from about 0.3% to about 15% by weight of an emulsification system comprising from about 0.1% to about 8% by weight of a cationic surfactant, from about 0.1% to about 8% by weight of an anionic surfactant, from about 0.1% to about 8% by weight of a bridging surfactant, from about 3% to about 70% by weight of an oil, from about 15% to about 97% by weight of water. See column 4, lines 50-65. Suitable anionic surfactants include an alkyl sulfate having an average of from about 8 to about 16 carbon atoms, an

alkyl ether sulfate having an average of from about 8 to about 16 carbon atoms in the alkyl portion and from about 1 to about 30 moles of ethylene oxide, etc. See column 9, lines 1-15. Suitable oils include a silicon oil, mineral oil, a cosmetic ester or petolatum, or a mixture thereof. See column 23, lines 45-60.

The compositions in final form may include may other optional ingredients such as pH adjusting agents including citric acid, succinic acid, etc. The compositions generally contain water as the solvent but may include other solvents such as ethanol, propanol, isopropanol, ethylene glycol, 1,3-propandiol, etc. The compositions generally contain from about 5 to about 90 percent by weight of solvent. Additionally, the pH of the compositions are generally from about 2 to about 10. See column 36, lines 1-25. Furthermore, the composition may contain a preservative such as benzyl alcohol, etc. See column 35, lines 50-55.

Bratescu et al do not teach the specific amounts of carboxylic acids, specific silicone derivatives, specific solvents, or a composition having the specific pH containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Evans et al teach a fiber treatment composition which contains siloxanes having amine- and polyol- functionalities. The composition provides good hand, resistance to yellowing, and hydrophilicity to the fibers. The composition is preferably formulated as an aqueous emulsion. See Abstract and column 3, lines 10-20. Note that, the siloxane as taught by Evans et al is the same as the silicone derivative as recited by the instant

claims. See column 3, lines 20-69. The textile treatment composition can have any suitable form. For example, the composition can be applied to the textile neat. However, the textile treatment composition can be a solution, dispersion, or emulsion. See column 6, lines 35-45. The fiber treatment composition can be applied to the fibers during the making of the fibers or later, such as during laundering the fabric. The textiles that can be treated with the textile treatment composition include natural fibers such as cotton, silk, linen, and wool; regenerated fibers such as rayon and acetate, synthetic fibers such as polyesters, polyamides, polyacrylonitriles, polyethylenes, etc. See column 7, lines 35-69.

Scialla et al teach self-thickened aqueous cleaning compositions which comprise an alkyl sulfate anionic surfactant and an electrolyte system. See Abstract. Specifically, Scialla et al teach self-thickened aqueous cleaning compositions containing from 1% to 25% by weight of an alkyl sulphate anionic surfactant derived from natural coconut oil, from 0.1 to 8% by weight of the total composition of ammonium salts, from 0.5% to 25% by weight of the total composition of an alkoxylated component, and from 0.01% to 0.5% by weight of the total composition of a capped 1,2-propylene terephthalate polyoxyethylene terephthalate polyester. See claim 1. The composition has a pH in the range of from 1 to 6. See claim 7. The compositions may be used for cleaning laundry. See column 5, lines 5-15. The compositions can be adjusted by the use of acidifiers such as citric acid, maleic acid, succinic acid, etc. See Column 3, lines 45-60. The acidifier may be used in amounts from 0.5 to 20% by weight and the Examiner asserts that this amount of acidifier is applicable to all the acids listed by

Scialla et al. See column 3, lines 55-69. Additionally, the compositions may also comprise conventional ingredients such as solvents, chelating agents, fragrances, etc. See column 4, lines 50-60.

Buzzacarini et al teach laundry articles for care of fabrics or combined cleaning and care of fabrics and methods of use of such articles. On combining the compositions from the multi-compartment containers, preferred articles provide heavy duty liquid laundry detergents having fabric care benefits. See Abstract. Suitable solvents include ethanol, isopropanol, propylene carbonate, etc. See para. 174.

Ushio et al are relied upon as set forth below.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a specific silicone derivative in the composition taught by Bratescu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Evans et al teach that the use of the specific silicone derivative in a similar composition used to launder or treat fabrics provides good hand, resistance to yellowing, and hydrophilicity to the textile fibers which would be desirable in the cleaning compositions taught by Bratescu et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an acid such as succinic acid in the composition taught by Bratescu et al in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Scialla et al teach the use of an acid pH adjusting agent in amounts which overlap with the ranges recited by the instant claims in a similar

composition and further, Bratescu et al teach the use of acid pH adjusting agents such as succinic acid.

With respect to instant claim 11, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use maleic acid in the composition taught by Bratescu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Scialla et al teach the equivalence of succinic acid to maleic acid as pH adjusters in a similar composition and further, Bratescu et al teach the use of succinic acid.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a solvent such as 2-benzyloxyethanol or propylene carbonate in the composition taught by Bratescu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Ushio et al and Buzzacarini et al teach the use of 2-benzyloxyethanol or propylene carbonate, respectively, in a similar composition and their equivalence to propanol or isopropanol in a similar composition and further, Bratescu et al teach the use of isopropanol or propanol.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the broad teachings of Bratescu et al in combination with Evans et al, Scialla et al, Ushio et al, and Buzzacarini et al suggest a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific

silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ushio et al (US 6,838,427) in view of Scialla et al (US 6,262,007) and Evans et al (6,171,515).

Ushio et al teach a softener composition which contains a cationic surfactant softener, an anionic surfactant, etc. See Abstract and column 1, lines 50-69. Suitable anionic surfactants include alkyl or alkyl ether sulfates, etc., which may be used in amounts from 0.5 to 30% by weight. The composition is preferably adjusted to a pH of 1 to 8.5. See column 6, lines 5-69. Additionally, the compositions may contain a solvent such as n-propanol, benzyl alcohol, 2-benzyloxyethanol, etc., in amounts from 0.5 to 40% by weight. See column 7, line 1 to column 8, line 50.

Ushio et al do not teach the specific amounts and types of carboxylic acids, specific silicone derivatives, or a composition having the specific pH containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Scialla et al and Evans et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a specific silicone derivative in the composition taught by Ushio et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Evans et al teach that the use of the specific silicone derivative in a similar composition used to launder or

treat fabrics provides provides good hand, resistance to yellowing, and hydrophilicity to the textile fibers which would be desirable in the cleaning compositions taught by Ushio et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use an acid such as maleic acid in the composition taught by Ushio et al in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Scialla et al teach the use of an acid pH adjusting agent such as maleic acid in amounts which overlap with the ranges recited by the instant claims in a similar composition and further, Ushio et al teach pH adjustment of the composition to reach an acidic pH which would require the use of a pH regulator (adjuster).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the broad teachings of Ushio et al in combination with Evans et al and Scialla et al suggest a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ushio et al (US 6,838,427) in view of Scialla et al (US 6,262,007) and Evans et al (6,171,515) as

applied to claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, and 21 above, and further in view of Buzzacarini et al (US 2002/0077265).

Ushio et al, Scialla et al, and Evans et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, none of the references teach the use of a solvent such as propylene carbonate in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

Buzzacarini et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use propylene carbonate in the composition taught by Ushio et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Buzzacarini et al teach the equivalence of propylene carbonate to isopropanol as solvents in a similar composition and further, Ushio et al teach the use of propanol in general.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scialla et al (US 6,262,007) in view of Evans et al (6,171,515), Ushio et al (US 6,838,427), and Buzzacarini et al (US 2002/0077265).

Scialla et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, Scialla et al do not teach the use of the specific silicone derivatives, specific solvent, conditioning agent, or a composition having the specific pH containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Evans et al, Ushio et al, and Buzzacarini et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a specific silicone derivative in the composition taught by Scialla et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Evans et al teach that the use of the specific silicone derivative in a similar composition used to launder or treat fabrics provides good hand, resistance to yellowing, and hydrophilicity to the textile fibers which would be desirable in the cleaning compositions taught by Scialla et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a solvent such as 2-benzyloxyethanol or propylene carbonate in the composition taught by Scialla et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Ushio et al and Buzzacarini et al teach the use of 2-benzyloxyethanol or propylene carbonate, respectively, in a similar composition and further, Scialla et al teach the use of solvents in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a softener such as a cationic surfactant in the composition taught by Scialla et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Ushio et al teach the use of cationic surfactants which provide fabric softening properties in a similar composition and further, such softeners would be desirable in the compositions taught by Scialla et al which are used to treat laundry.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims,

with a reasonable expectation of success, because the broad teachings of Scialla et al in combination with Evans et al, Ushio et al, or Buzzacarini et al suggest a composition containing an anionic surfactant, a carboxylic acid, a specific silicone derivative, solvent, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Response to Arguments

Note that, Applicant states that benzyl alcohol is now excluded from the scope of the present claims and thus, the rejection(s) using Bratescu et al should now be withdrawn. In response, note that, the Examiner asserts that Bratescu et al teach that benzyl alcohol is an optional preservative component such that benzyl alcohol is not a required component. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that a new ground(s) of rejection have been made, as set forth above, which presents combinations of references which are sufficient to render the claimed invention obvious under 35 USC 103.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory R. Del Cotto/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/G. R. D./
September 30, 2009